

**EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**  
**Examining Group Number 2800**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant:	Nicola Da Dalt	Examiner:	Levi Gannon
Serial No.:	10/541,049	Group Art Unit:	2817
Filed:	February 13, 2006	Docket No.:	I435.128.101/12928US
Title:	DEVICE AND METHOD FOR FREQUENCY SYNTHESIS		

---

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116 AND**  
**EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

**Mail Stop AF**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

**Telephonic Examiner Interview Summary**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the telephonic examiner interviews on January 14 and January 15 of 2008 between Examiner Levi Gannon and Applicant's representative attorney Patrick G. Billig. In the examiner interviews, attorney Billig pointed out the distinguishing features of independent claims 1 and 29 over the Duff GB Patent No. 2002157. Examiner Gannon indicated that he understood some of the points and would further consider these points in a response to final office action.

In the examiner interviews, attorney Billig also suggested possible amendments to dependent claim 24 similar to the below amendments to claim 24 and further suggested that similar limitations as included in amended dependent claim 24 be added as a new dependent claim 40 depending from independent claim 29. Applicant believes that the below amended claim 24 and new claim 40 are allowable over the cited Duff GB Patent.

In addition, attorney Billig also pointed out in the examiner interview that the Examiner's statement incorporated into the final office action based on the previous statement in the non-final office action that an analog to digital conversion principal is one form of delta-sigma conversion is incorrect as delta-sigma conversion is a special form of analog to digital conversion. Examiner Gannon agreed to this and indicated that accordingly the Duff GB Patent does not teach or suggest the limitation of dependent claim 18.